	Case 3:08-cv-00719-BTM-RBB Docum	ent 2	Filed 04/28/2008	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	LINUTED OTA:	FEO DI		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
1011	BARBARA A. LIPPOLD,	ı	CASE NO. 08cv0	710 DTM/DDD\
	·	4:44		,
1213	Plair v.	11111,	ORDER TO SHO CASE SHOULD REMANDED	
14	FATHER & SON MOVING & STORAGE and DOES 1-10,		KLIMANDED	
15	Defendants.			
16				
17	On April 21, 2008, Defendant removed this action from the Superior Court of			
18	California, County of San Diego. Defendant contends that the Court has removal jurisdiction			
19	because Plaintiff's state claims are completely preempted by the Carmack Amendment, 49			
20	U.S.C. § 14706.			
21	The Ninth Circuit has held that the Carmack Amendment completely preempts state			
22	law claims under an interstate shipping contract alleging delay, loss, failure to deliver o			
23	damage to property. Hall v. North American Van Lines, Inc., 476 F.3d 683, 687-88 (9th Cir			

2007). "It is well settled that the Carmack Amendment is the exclusive cause of action for interstate-shipping contract claims alleging loss or damage to property." Id. at 688.

24

25

26

27

28

In this case, however, it appears that the Carmack Amendment is inapplicable because Plaintiff did not hire Defendant to transport her property in interstate commerce. Based upon the Complaint and the attached exhibit, the contract was an agreement to transport Plaintiff's property from Plaintiff's home in Rancho Bernardo to Defendant's storage facility in San Diego and to store the property in that storage facility. Nothing in the Complaint or the agreement indicates that the contract was part of an interstate bill of lading that is subject to the Carmack Amendment. See Insurance C. of North America v. NNR Aircargo Service (USA), Inc., 201 F.3d 1111, 1115 (9th Cir. 2000) (holding that Carmack Amendment did not apply because the defendant was not hired to transport golf balls in interstate commerce).

Therefore, the Court **ORDERS** Defendant to **SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS CASE SHOULD NOT BE REMANDED**. The parties may file papers in response to this OSC on or before May 12, 2008. The matter will be set for hearing on **May 23, 2008 at 11:00 a.m.** Unless otherwise directed by the Court, there shall be no oral argument and no personal appearances are required.

my Ted Workout

Honorable Barry Ted Moskowitz

United States District Judge

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 28, 2008